

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-26, and 32 have been amended. Claims 10, 16, 19, 20, 23, 27-31, and 35-40 have been canceled. New claims 41-44 have been added. As such, claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-26, 32-34, and 41-44 remain pending in the present application.

The drawings stand objected to because the drawings are informal. Attached hereto are eight (8) sheets of formal drawings. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1-9, 12-22, 25, 26, 32-35, 38, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,913,052 to Beatty et al. ("Beatty"). Claims 1 and 32, as amended, recite the features of "rendering, via a visualizer, a plurality of graphical elements representative of the architectural components,...the graphical representation dependent on a particular mode of a plurality of modes of operation of the visualizer" and "displaying, on a web page, the graphical representation of the underlying architecture."

As noted at page 9 of the Office Action, Beatty does not explicitly disclose a graphical display is a web page. Therefore, Beatty does not teach displaying on a web page as recited in claims 1 and 32. Furthermore, Beatty does not teach that a graphical representation of the architectural components is dependent on a particular mode of a plurality of modes of operation of the visualizer. Instead, Beatty teaches a system with one mode, i.e., a debugging mode. *See* Beatty, col. 2, lines 25-30. As such, the graphical representation is not dependent on the mode of operation. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 distinguishes over Beatty and requests that the §102 rejection of claims 1 and 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9, 12-15, 33, and 34 are directly or indirectly dependent on one of claims 1 and 32 and should distinguish over Beatty for at least the same reasons as stated above. Claims 16, 19, 20, 35, 38, and 40 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 now depend from new claim 41 which is discussed in detail below.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 2-9, 12-15, 33, and 34 be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 27-31, 36, 37, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beatty in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962 to Weinberg et al. (“Weinberg”). Claims 10, 23, 27-31, 36, 37, and 39 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Claim 24 now depends from new claim 41 and is discussed in detail below.

Claim 11 distinguishes over Beatty for at least the same reasons as stated above. Weinberg does not remedy the deficiencies of Beatty in that Weinberg also does not teach that the graphical representation depends on a particular mode of a plurality of modes of operation of the visualizer. Instead, Weinberg teaches visualization of a website. Weinberg does not appear to teach or suggest different modes of operation or differing the graphical representation based on the particular mode of operation. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 distinguishes over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg and request that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

New claim 41 recites, in part, the features of “an application service provider (ASP) system for visualizing an architecture of another distinct system,” and “a visualizer for receiving the transformed datafile and visualizing the architecture, the visualizer operating in one of a plurality of modes of operation.” As noted above, neither Beatty nor Weinberg, taken alone or in combination, teach a visualizer capable of operating in a plurality of modes of operation.

In addition, neither Beatty nor Weinberg teach a system for visualizing an architecture of *another distinct system*. Instead, Beatty teaches debugging a Digital Signal Processor (DSP) of a computer running the simulation. *See* Beatty, Figure 1 and col. 4, line 54 - col. 5, line 11. Similarly, Weinberg teaches mapping a web site to analyze content and links to URLs and therefore Weinberg does not teach visualizing an architecture of another distinct system. Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 41 distinguishes over the art of record.

Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, and 24-26 are either directly or indirectly dependent on new claim 41 and should distinguish over the art of record for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 and §103 rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

New claims 42-44 are directly dependent from claim 1 and should distinguish over the art of record for at least the same reasons as stated above.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: 7/15/04

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ashley N. Moore

Registration No.: 51,667

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant

Attachments